In re: Molnar

Serial No.: 09/464,830 Filed: December 17, 1999

Page 11 of 11

## REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the continued thorough examination of the present application that is reflected in the Final Official Action of August 10, 2004, as well as the continued indication that Claims 7-18 and 25-36 are allowed and that Claims 4-6 and 22-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant also appreciates the telephone interview with the Examiner of September 1, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner suggested that a recitation of "a second criterion that is different from the first criterion" be added to dependent Claims 2 and 20. The Examiner further indicated that Claims 2 and 20 would be allowable if they were amended to include this recitation and were rewritten in independent form. The present amendment is being filed to place the present application in condition for allowance in response to the telephone interview with the Examiner.

In particular, Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the recitations of dependent Claim 2 and to include the recitation of "a second criterion that is different from the first criterion," as suggested by the Examiner. Similarly, Claim 19 has been rewritten to include the recitations of dependent Claim 20 and the recitation of "a second criterion that is different from the first criterion". Also, Claim 4 has been amended to include the recitations of Claim 3, and Claim 22 has been amended to include the recitations of dependent Claim 21. Claims 2-3 and 20-21 have been canceled.

Accordingly, as Claims 7-18 and 25-36 are allowed and Claims 4-6 and 22-24 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claims 1 or 19, all of the pending claims now are in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A 6. 880

Dated: October 6, 2004 Rohan G. Sabapathypillai

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 51,074